Kelly Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)
Technical Review Subcommittee (TRS)
Meeting of September 10, 2002

Attendees

Air Force Base Conversion Agency (AFBCA):
Mr. Ryan, William

Booz Allen & Hamilton (Booz Allen):
Ms. Best, Christine
Ms. Costello, Carol
Mr. Courtney, Scott
Mr. Davis, Ron
Mr. Martinez, E.

CH2Mhill:
Mr. Clary, Jim

Clearwater Revival Company:
Mr. Lynch, Patrick

Community:
Mr. Galvan, Ben
Mr. Garcia, Rodrigo
Dr. Lene, Gene
Mr. Montoya, Joe
Mr. Murrah, Sam
Mr. Perez, Nazarite
Mr. Quintanilla, Armando
Mr. Silvas, Robert

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA):
Mr. Miller, Gary

San Antonio Metropolitan Health Department (SAMHD):
Ms. Cunningham, Kyle
Ms. Hernandez, Blanca
Ms. Kaufman, Linda
Ms. Martinez, Deborah

Smith & Associates:
Dr. Smith, David

Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission (TNRCC):
Ms. Power, Abbi
Mr. Weegar, Mark

Introduction
Background materials were presented to attendees. This package consisted of the agenda for the evening's meeting (Attachment 1), minutes of the August 13, 2002 TRS meeting, BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) meeting, a presentation of the review of the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) program and a draft RAB membership application.

Review of Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU)
The current status of the corrective measures being taken by the Air Force in the area of former Buildings 258, 259 and 259 A were covered (Attachment 2). This is the center of the dense non-aqueous phase liquid (DNAPL) area.

Slurry walls 300' long in a square shape have been constructed in order to contain the DNAPL. Also, a ground water pump and treat system has been installed at the site boundary. Measurements of the groundwater on both sides of the wall have been taken. In addition to DNAPL, arsenic was found both inside and outside the wall. However, the concentration was less than the maximum contaminant level (MCL) allowed by federal standards for drinking water. There is some leakage of DNAPL from outside the wall to the inside of the contained area because of differential pressure. In order to enhance long-term monitoring, the construction of well pairs was suggested.

It was concluded that the activities of the Air Force have been appropriate in furthering the recovery of the area.

Questions from the Committee members included the following:

Q. What is the depth of the slurry wall?
A. It is 40-46' deep, reaching into the Navarro clay level.

Q. Is the wall designed to leak?
A. No, but actually the leakage is beneficial as DNAPL in the area outside the wall leaches into the walled-off area and results in more rapid restoration. In the future, there will be improved monitoring of the leakage around the wall.

Q. Where are the present wells around the slurry walls?
A. Mr. Lynch provided a diagram.

Q. What is the time frame for the recovery of the area?
A. In the area to the east of the plume, it is estimated that in 9 years, recovery will be complete. In the building 258 area, given that 1,000 gallons of DNAPL per year are emitted, and that the rate will slow in the future due to decreases in pressure, recovery will require more than sixteen years.

Q. What is the effect of the excessive amount of rain on recovery?
A. Rain basically has a negative effect, as it fills up and dilutes the interior of the slurry wall, simultaneously increasing pressure within the wall. As a result, less inward movement of DNAPL from outside the wall occurs.

Q. Can foul smells in the area be related to the evaporation of DNAPL from this area?
A. Without further details, this is difficult to answer, but a cause and effect relationship seems unlikely. The area in question is now covered by a parking lot.

Q. Are there more details than the current interim Clearwater report (Attachment 3)?
A. Specific questions should be submitted in writing and will be answered. The final report is due to be presented to the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) at their meeting in November 2002.

Q. Will the proposed Kelly Parkway construction endanger the areas where the plume exists in the groundwater layer?
A. This is an important area for further investigation. Soil studies and maps will be made available for further examination.

Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Process
The function of Booz Allen to act as a single point of contact between the various groups was restated.

The framework for identification of projects and obtaining funding was reviewed (Attachment 4). At present there is a budget surplus of $22,278.50 which can be devoted to projects of interest to the group. There was some concern about the provision of future funding, which can be done via waiver. The role of TAPP is not to collect data, but to evaluate the studies for the community.

According to budget history, each study costs approximately $6,000. After some discussion, the following projects were prioritized:
1.) The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) Air Emission Study
2.)Zone 2 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Facility Investigation (RFI)
3.)The Zone 2/3 Corrective Measures Survey (CMS) study

There was a question as to whether the Statement of Work (SOW) would constrain progress, but it was explained that the SOW is an integral part of funding and monitoring the work.

Administrative Wrap-Up
Agenda items for the next TRS meeting on December 10, 2002 were solicited.

Agenda for the October and November 2002 RAB is being drafted.

The participants were reminded that a draft application for appointment to RAB was in the meeting folder. On January 13 and 14, 2003 there will be oral applications at the RAB meeting.

Carol Costello September 17, 2002